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Even if only a small portion of semantic map research has tried to integrate the diachronic dimension so far, these efforts turn out to be crucial from a methodological point of view (Georgakopoulos & Polis 2018)

→ “the best synchronic semantic map is a diachronic one” (van der Auwera, 2008: 43)

diachronic semantic maps “allow one to explain exceptions to the connectivity hypothesis” → connectivity hypothesis: “any relevant language-specific and construction-specific category should map onto a CONNECTED REGION in conceptual space” (Croft, 2001: 96)
Violations of the connectivity hypothesis

- Homonyms

- Dynamicized semantic maps, given their capacity to integrate the diachronic dimension, make it possible to explain the lack of connectedness between the meanings of a given linguistic forms in synchrony if (and only if) these meanings derive from a common “ancestor,” namely, a meaning previously expressed by the same form.

- Language contact situations, two types of exceptions to the connectivity hypothesis have been noticed in the literature. First, several scholars observed that areal factors possibly lead to the extension of the meaning of a linguistic form in a given language based on the meaning of a similar expression in a (prestigious) neighboring language.

- The polysemy network of the adpositions in the donor language is not borrowed as a whole.
“The classical “connectivity” maps ... predict that “a category can acquire a new function only if that function is adjacent on the semantic map to some function that the category already covers” (Haspelmath 1997: 129).

“Conceptual and historical factors support the connectivity hypothesis. In practical terms, this means that polysemous linguistic items are decisive when plotting a map. Indeed, they are the ones that will be mapped onto two (or more) nodes, and they indicate thereby which nodes should be connected: by virtue of the connectivity hypothesis, they must cover a connected region in the semantic map.” (Georgakopoulos & Polis 2018: 6)
Figure 1 (Haspelmath 2003: 213)

Figure 1a predicts that, if a linguistic item expresses ... these two meanings [sc. “purpose” and “direction”] and an additional one, it should necessarily be “recipient,” because it is the only meaning directly connected to “purpose-direction.” (Georgakopoulos and Polis 2018: 2-3)
English for (OEG)

- In support of or in favour of (a person or policy)
  ‘troops who had fought for Napoleon’
  ‘they voted for independence in a referendum’
- On behalf of or to the benefit of.
  ‘I got a present for you’
  ‘these parents aren't speaking for everyone’
- Having (the thing mentioned) as a purpose or function.
  ‘networks for the exchange of information’
  ‘the necessary tools for making a picture frame’
- Having (the place mentioned) as a destination.
  ‘they are leaving for London tomorrow’
French *pour* (Larousse)

- Le lieu où l'on va :
  *Partir pour Paris.*

- Le but :
  *La lutte pour le pouvoir.*

- Le bénéficiaire :
  *Travailler pour un patron.*

- La personne ou la chose dans l'intérêt de qui ou au profit de quoi est fait quelque chose :
  *Se battre pour une noble cause.*
Rice and Kabata (2007) list for among prepositions that instantiate the common Direction-Purpose polysemy which, as the authors point out, is based on the metaphor PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS ➔ Direction is the source for semantic extension

BUT: Bosworth and Toller (1898/1921)

Old English for:

- Purpose
- Cause
- Exchange
- Beneficiary

➔ it did not indicate Direction
Latin *pro*.

Cognate of English *for*, preserved the spatial meaning ‘before’, ‘in front of’ inherited from Proto-Indo-European only sporadically in Early Latin (Leumann and Hofmann 1965: 270).

Early Latin: Most frequent meaning Exchange; Beneficiary (especially behalf type)

Classical Latin: Reason

Late Latin: Cause

Early French: Purpose

*Le Bon Usage* Grevisse (1993: 485) «Depuis le XVIIe siècle, on peut indiquer aussi la destination qui est introduite par *pour*: “Je pars demain *pour* ma Bourgogne” (Sév., 10 octobre 1673) – “Je pars demain *pour* Londres qui est le lieu du monde où le peuple est le plus méchant” (Richelet, 1680)». 
‘Well behaved’ prepositions

Figure 2. English to / French à (Haspelmath 2003)

(French à also indicates Beneficiary and to a limited extent Purpose: Jean a acheté des jolies fleurs à Marie / La salle à manger)
Space as a source domain

- Old English tó
- Direction / Location (mostly nearby)
- Latin *ad*
  Direction / Location nearby
- Old English *for* and Latin *pro* < PIE *pro* ‘in front of’ (Location)
- Earliest common meaning extension: ‘in exchange for’
Chain of increasing grammaticalization

Heine et al. (1991: 160)

spatial relation > human relation > inanimate relation

FIGURE 3. CHAIN OF INCREASING GRAMMATICALIZATION (from Heine et al. 1991: 159)
Figure 4. Map of increasing grammaticalization (Narrog 2014: 89)
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Figure 5 (Croft 2012: 225)

Figure 6 – Motion Event

Fig. 7 – The conceptual domain of space (Luraghi 2014)
Figure 8. (Croft 2012: 280)

**Figure 6.2.** A tentative conceptual space for participant roles.
Figure 9. (Luraghi 2014: 142)
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SOURCE DOMAIN: SPACE

TARGET DOMAIN: PURPOSE/BENEFACTION
Laz, Kartvelian (Lacroix 2009, 2010)

1

\[ ma \quad da\text{-}tkvani \quad seni \quad ti\text{-}\text{"}ckimi \quad go\text{-}b\text{-}o\text{-}ndin\text{-}am \]

1s sister\text{-}Poss2PL for head\text{-}Poss1SG PV\text{-}11\text{-}VAL1\text{-}lose\text{-}STH

‘I am ready to die for your sister.’

2

\[ malte\text{-}pe\text{-}se \quad i\text{-}d\text{-}u \quad da\text{ç}xui \quad seni \]

neighbor\text{-}PL\text{-}ALL go\text{-}AOR.13SG fire for

‘She goes to her neighbor to get fire.’ (K’72.144)

3

\[ Arslan\text{-}epe \quad k\text{‘}ala\text{-}na \quad i\text{-}rd\text{-}u \quad šen \quad arslani\text{\text{"}} \quad skiri \]

lion\text{-}PL with\text{-}SBJV MID\text{-}grow\text{-}AOR.13SG for lion\text{-}GEN son

ko\text{-}gy\text{-}o\text{-}d\text{-}u\text{-}dore\text{.}

PV\text{-}PV\text{-}TR\text{-}name\text{-}AOR.13SG\text{-}EVD

‘Since he had grown up with lions, he named him “Lion’s son”.’ (Dum67.I.101)

4

\[ A\text{"}zliya\text{-}s \quad me\text{-}p\text{-}č\text{-}am\text{-}t \quad ar \quad vedre \quad ck\text{‘}ari \quad šeni \text{.} \]

dragon\text{-}DAT PV\text{-}11\text{-}give\text{-}THS\text{-}PL one bucket water for

‘We give him to the dragon in exchange for one bucket of water.’
Andrason (2016: 2) the meanings are connected because they arise due to human cognitive mechanisms, being derived by means of metaphor, image-schema process, metonymy, analogy or abduction. ... On the other hand, they constitute a temporally sequential chain of predecessor and successors.
Covering relation and the notion of exchange

X acts in the place of / in exchange for Y

‘Behalf’ of ‘surrogate’ beneficiary:

From Exchange to Purpose and Cause

Exchange is an intentional action → REASON

CAUSE

PURPOSE
Where does the directional meaning of *for* come from?

a. *Mary set out/started/left to the store*

b. *They departed to France*

c. *They set sail/out to Nova Scotia*

Each of the verbs in these sentences relates to the beginning phase of a journey. As such, each is related to the intentional processes of selecting a particular destination, choosing a mode of travel and, presumably consciously, selecting a certain course. Hence, we suggest that due to the salience of intentional components associated with these meaning elements, *for* is acceptable, while *to* is not.

(Tyler & Evans 2003: 147)
Where does the directional meaning of *for* come from?

“We hypothesize that that intentionality is an important aspect of the functional element associated with *for* but not with *to.*” (Tyler & Evans 2003: 147)

The diachronic data shows an unexpected semantic extension:

**purpose → allative**

- from an abstract domain to space
Language contact situations → Extension through translation

Brugman (1988: 49)
“A metaphorical use of over arises with verbs of emotional response, its meaning being roughly ‘about’ or ‘as a response to.’ ... the place of this sense in my overall description is unclear.”

Origin of ‘cry over’
bənōwt yiśrā’ēl, ’el-šā’ūl bəkenāh.
dughters Israel to-Saul cry
thugatēres Israēl, epi Saoul klaúsate
filiae Israel super Saul flete
‘Ye daughters of Israel, weep over Saul.’ (2 Samuel 1.24)

wayyōsipū kāl hā’am liḇkōwt ‘ālāw.
and-again all the-people cried over-him
omnis populus flevit super eum
‘And all the people wept again over him.’ (2 Samuel 3.34)

idōn tēn pólin éklausen ep’ autēn
videns civitatem flevit super illam
‘He beheld the city, and wept over it’ (Luke 19.41)
Over with verbs of rejoicing

Bosworth/Toller

- denoting the cause of an emotion, over (as in to rejoice over, etc.)

Byþ on heofone blis be ánum synfullun þe dædbóte dép, má ðonne ofer nigon and nigontigum rihtwísra, Lk. 15, 7.

Ic blissige ofer ðínre sprǽce, Ps. Th. 118, 162
dico vobis quod ita gaudium erit in caelo super uno peccatore paenitentiam habente quam super nonaginta novem iustis qui non indigent paenitentia
In the name of X

Biblical Hebrew bišem
Septuagint / New Testament Greek epì / en toi onómati
Vulgate in nomine
Bosworth/Toller
of representative character, in the name of
In Crístes noman ... and in þáre hálgan róde naman (Homilies)
Lack of connectedness between the meanings of a given linguistic forms in synchrony → meanings deriving from a common “ancestor”

The dative case in Classical Greek

Semantic roles:
- Recipient
- Beneficiary
- Addressee
- Experiencer
- Possessor
- Instrument
Figure 8. (Croft 280)
Figure 9. (Luraghi 2014: 142)
humîn  gráphō  hóti ...
2PL.DAT write:PRS.1SG that
“I write you that ...” (Th. 7.14.1);
hupográpsantes  grammàs  têi  graphídi
write:PTCP.AOR.NOM.PL  letter:ACC.PL.F ART.DAT.F  pen:DAT.F
“having drawn lines with the pen” (Pl. Prt. 326d).
Case syncretism and the Greek dative: IE dative + locative + instrumental

(A) MERGER OF THE DATIVE WITH THE LOCATIVE

(most likely pre-Mycenaean)

patēr d’ emòs Æργεί násthē

father: NOM PTC POSS.1SG.NOM A.:DAT abide: AOR.3SG

“my father lived in Argos” (ll. 14.119)

(B) MERGER OF THE DATIVE/LOCATIVE WITH THE INSTRUMENTAL

(post-Mycenaean)

The container schema:

Functional analysis for ‘in’: a container exerts dynamic control over its content (Vandeloise 1994)
space mapped onto causation/agency

dynamic control → exploitation

container instrument

Néstor d' en kheíressi láb' hēnía sigalóenta
N.:NOM PTC in hand:DAT.PL.F take:AOR.3SG rein:N/A.PL shining:N/A.PL
“Nestor took in his hands the shining reins” (ll. 8.116)

ho dé khermádion lábe kheirí
DEM.NOM PTC stone:N/A take:AOR.3SG hand:DAT.F
“(Aeneas) grasped a stone in his hand” (ll. 20.285)

tòn mèn egō mála pollà ... ophthalmoīsin ópōpa
DEM.ACC PTC 1SG.NOM very many:N/A.PL eye:DAT.PL see:PF.1SG
“several times I have seen him with my eyes” (ll. 24.391-392)
epeì oú pô tlêsom’ en ophthalmoîsin horâsthai

since NEG PTC bear:FUT.MID.1SG in eye:DAT.PL see:INF.PRS.M/P

marnámenon phílon huiòn ... Meneláoí

fight:PART.PRS.ACC dear:ACC son:ACC M.:DAT

“since I can in no way bear to behold with my eyes my dear son doing battle with Menelaus“ (ll. 3.306)

eis Áidos d’ oú pô tis aphíketo nêí melainêi
to Hades:GEN PTC NEG PTC INDEF.NOM come:AOR.M/P.3SG ship:DAT.F black:DAT.F

“no man ever reached Hades by means of a black ship” (Od. 10.502).

Argêíoi d’ en nêusî philên es patród’ ébēsan

Argive:NOM.PL PTC in ship:DAT.PL.F their:ACC.F to homeland:ACC.F go:AOR.3PL

“the Argives had gone back in their ships to their native land” (ll. 12.16)
Biblical Hebrew – preposition *b-*

Dawid maslip  ’et-suso  ba-ssot
David whip:3SG his-horse:ACC with whip
“David whips his horse with a whip”

’ayil ’ehad ne’ehaz  ba-ssbak be-qarnaw
ram one entangled in-bush with its-horn
“a ram entangled in the bush by its horns”.

Finnish – adessive case

kupit  ovat  pöydällä
cup:NOM-PL be:3PL table:ADESS
“the cups are on the table”;

hän  kirjoittaa  kynällä
he write:3SG pen:ADESS
“he writes with a pen”.
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It is apparent that several of these means of locomotion are conceptualized as a location rather than as an instrument. (Lehmann, Shin 2005: 47)

Some instruments are shaped as containers, and other as means of support: this fact accounts for the extension of different locative markers to instrument, based on various transfers and extensions. (Luraghi 2014)

Analogy:

- some containers/supports are instruments $\rightarrow$ all instruments are encoded as instatiating a containment/support relation.
- extraction of a schema (see Langacker 1987) whereby certain types of instrument have certain spatial dimensions (container, support) - analogical extension of this schema to all types of instrument
INTEGRATING DIACHRONIC INFORMATION
IN SEMANTIC MAPS

Figure 4. The dative as a radial category in Homeric Greek

dative proper

iudicantis

recipient

beneficiary

experiencer

possessor

[d +human]

instrumental dative

cause

instrument

manner

ornative

sociative

[-human]
Classical Greek: locative only en+dative → center of the category disappears

Polysemy or homonymy?

✓ diachronic change keeps the two groups of meanings distinct:

instrumental dative: PPs with me(tá) ‘with’

dative proper: PPs with (ei)s (‘to’, genitive limited to pronouns)

Byzantine Greek

New metaphors:
✓ INSTRUMENT: me ‘with’ < metá ‘together with’ extends to instrument through the Companion metaphors (cf. Lakoff, Johnson 1980: 135) “An instrument is a companion” → an instrument accompanies an acting agent
✓ DATIVE: extension from direction to beneficiary and recipient → “A beneficiary/recipient is the endpoint of a trajectory”

NO overlap!
Why are meanings dropped?

1. Ablative and locative

_PATTERN OF SYNCRETISM FOR THE LEXICALIZATION OF LOCATION, GOAL, AND SOURCE (Pantcheva 2010)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L≠G≠S</td>
<td>91% (77/85)</td>
<td>33% (25/76)</td>
<td>53% (28/53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L=G≠S</td>
<td>9% (8/85)</td>
<td>58% (44/76)</td>
<td>34% (18/53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L=G=S</td>
<td>0% (0/85)</td>
<td>4% (3/76)</td>
<td>13% (7/53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L=S≠G</td>
<td>0% (0/85)</td>
<td>2,5% (2/76)</td>
<td>0% (0/53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L≠G=S</td>
<td>0% (0/85)</td>
<td>2,5% (2/76)</td>
<td>0% (0/53)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## French place adverbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>(verb) + (adverb)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>devant</td>
<td>‘before’</td>
<td>&lt; de + avant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dehors</td>
<td>‘outside’</td>
<td>&lt; de + hors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dessus</td>
<td>‘above’</td>
<td>&lt; de + sus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dessous</td>
<td>‘underneath’</td>
<td>&lt; de + sous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deçà</td>
<td>‘on this side’</td>
<td>&lt; de + ça</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delà</td>
<td>‘on that side’</td>
<td>&lt; de + là</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Il est/ va dehors vs. Il vient de dehors*

he is/goes outside  he comes from outside

‘He is/goes outside.’/‘He comes from outside.’
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**Spanish**
- *donde* ‘where’ < *de-unde* ‘from-whence’ (Vulgar Latin)
- *dentro* ‘inside’ < *de intro* ‘from inside’ (Vulgar Latin)
- *debajo* ‘underneath’ < *de basso* ‘from low’ (Vulgar Latin)
- *delante* ‘in front’ < *de in-ante* ‘from in-before’ (Vulgar Latin)

**Italian**
- *disotto* ‘underneath’ < *de subtus* ‘from underneath’ (Vulgar Latin)
- *davanti* ‘in front’ < *de ab-ante* ‘from from-before’ (Vulgar Latin)
- *dinanzi* ‘in front’ < *de in-antea* ‘from in-before’ (Vulgar Latin)
- *dietro* ‘behind’ < *de retro* ‘from behind’ (Vulgar Latin)
Source:

A TR moves away from a LM

Fictive motion (cf. Talmy 2000)

→ in expressions such as *to be far from* a location is referred to in terms of the trajectory that would lead from it to a reference point, if the trajector moved

→ Ablative-locative transfer: the ablative marker indicates a location removed from the LM
Cf. Latin:

a. adverbs in -

b. adverbs in -ā (from the ablative adjectives modifying parte ‘part’ or viā ‘way’):
   intrā ‘inside’ (< *interā parte), suprā ‘above’ (< *superā parte)

c. adverbs in dē- (ablative prefix): dēsuper ‘(from) above’, dēsub ‘(from) below’
Old High German place adverbs (Mackenzie 1978)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Loc</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Abl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THERE</td>
<td>dår</td>
<td>dara or darôt</td>
<td>dannana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERE</td>
<td>hiar</td>
<td>hera or herôt</td>
<td>hinana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHERE</td>
<td>hwâr</td>
<td>hwara or hwarôt</td>
<td>wannana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSIDE</td>
<td>inne</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>innana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE</td>
<td>ûze</td>
<td>ûzô</td>
<td>ûzana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOVE</td>
<td>obc</td>
<td>*ob</td>
<td>obana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELOW</td>
<td>nidare</td>
<td>*nidar</td>
<td>nidana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN FRONT</td>
<td>fore or forn</td>
<td>*forn</td>
<td>forna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHIND</td>
<td>*hindare</td>
<td>*hindar</td>
<td>hindana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>ôstert</td>
<td>ôstar</td>
<td>ôstana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>westerhalb</td>
<td>westar</td>
<td>westana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>nordert</td>
<td>*nordar</td>
<td>nordana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>sundert</td>
<td>sundar</td>
<td>sundana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>heime</td>
<td>heim</td>
<td>heimana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Modern High German

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Loc</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Abl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>There</strong></td>
<td>{ dort }</td>
<td>{ dort }</td>
<td>{ dort }</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Here</strong></td>
<td>da</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where</strong></td>
<td>hier</td>
<td>hierhin</td>
<td>hier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wo</td>
<td>wohin</td>
<td>woher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inside</strong></td>
<td>innen</td>
<td>nach innen</td>
<td>von innen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside</strong></td>
<td>aussen</td>
<td>nach aussen</td>
<td>von aussen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Above</strong></td>
<td>oben</td>
<td>nach oben</td>
<td>von oben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Below</strong></td>
<td>unten</td>
<td>nach unten</td>
<td>von unten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Front</strong></td>
<td>vorn</td>
<td>nach vorn</td>
<td>von vorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behind</strong></td>
<td>hinten</td>
<td>nach hinten</td>
<td>von hinten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East</strong></td>
<td>im Osten</td>
<td>nach Osten</td>
<td>von Osten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West</strong></td>
<td>im Westen</td>
<td>nach Westen</td>
<td>von Westen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North</strong></td>
<td>im Norden</td>
<td>nach Norden</td>
<td>von Norden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South</strong></td>
<td>im Süden</td>
<td>nach Süden</td>
<td>von Süden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home</strong></td>
<td>daheim</td>
<td>heim</td>
<td>von zu Hause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{ zu Hause }</td>
<td>{ nach Hause }</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Modern Hebrew

Ablative preposition: *mi-*

Ha-ojev hitkarev *mi-smol.*
the-enemy approached from-left
‘The enemy approached from the left’
Hu hegi’ax *mi-taxat ha-šulxan*
he emerged from-under the-table
‘He emerged from under the table’
Ha-zvuv af *mi-ha-šulxan*
the-fly flew from-the-table
‘The fly flew off the table’.
Modern Hebrew

Local adverbs:

Locative: zero-marking
Allative: -a
Ablative: mi-

Al ‘on’ me-al < mi+al ‘over, above’ (NOT: ‘from above’)

Ha-zvuv nimtsa al ha-šulxan
the-fly is-situated on the-table
‘The fly is on the table’
Ha-zvuv nimtsa me-al ha-šulxan
the-fly is-situated from-on the-table
‘The fly is above the table’.
Fijan

**Locative:** $e$ \hspace{1cm} ($e$ *na* vale \hspace{1cm} ‘in the house’)

**Allative:** $ki$ \hspace{1cm} ($ki$ *na* vale \hspace{1cm} ‘to the house’)

**Ablative:** $mai$ \hspace{1cm} ($mai$ *na* vale \hspace{1cm} ‘from the house’)

Where the nominal following the particle is used to refer to an entity distant from the speaker, locative is realized as *mai*, so that *mai vale* may be interpreted either as ‘from home’ or, if the speaker is himself away from home, as ‘at home’.

Ko ā kunea maivei?
did you find whence
‘Where did you find it?’ (Likelihood: somewhere far off)
Erau sā lako maivei?
they have come from-where
‘Where have they come from?’
Sonsorol-Tobian (Micronesian)

Locative: *ni*
Allative: Ø
Ablative: *me or ifi (ri)*

Human landmarks:

I bwe sóje me iqlom i da ra ifi ri neirai
I purposive-marker go from with-you I consecutive-marker go from of mother
‘I will go from you to my mother’.
**Summary**

- Syncretism of locative and allative → happens in diachrony and is ok in synchrony
- Syncretism of locative and ablative → happens in diachrony but is avoided in synchrony
Why are meanings dropped?

2. Locative and comitative

(D6) Neighbourhood relations of source concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP FORMATION</th>
<th>SOCIAL CLOSENESS</th>
<th>SPATIAL PROXIMITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>company</td>
<td>body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accompany</td>
<td>follow</td>
<td>meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>companion</td>
<td>be near to</td>
<td>side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>company</td>
<td>friend</td>
<td>be allied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lesgian: Haspelmath (1993: 225–226): two postpositions which are used to express Comitativity in Lesgian are grammaticalized converbal forms of locative copulas: *galaz* ‘with’ < *gala* ‘to be behind something’ and *gwaz* ‘with’ < *gwa* ‘to be at’.

Romance: Stroh (1998) Romance languages (French, Catalan, Gascon, Provençal, etc.) comitatives derive from Latin human locatives *apud*, *ab hoc*, only later integrating Instrumentality in their functional domain.

Germanic languages: English *with*, from O.E. *wið* ‘against, opposite to’ and German *mit*, from Proto-Germanic *medi*-, cognate of English *middle* (Luraghi 2014)

Greek: Greek *me*, from Ancient Greek *metá*, original meaning ‘among’ limited to human landmarks then Comitative (Classical Greek) and later (Middle Greek) extending to Instrument (see Luraghi 2001b and 2005c on this development)

**SPATIAL MEANING LOST!**
Four parameters determine the choice of the concept which serves as a source of the grammaticalised item: Identity (= companion and accompanee are conceptualised as being one), group (= companion and accompanee are conceptualised as forming a higher level unit composed of two independent entities), social closeness (= companion and accompanee are conceptualised as being in a relation of mutual trust and friendship) and, last but not least, spatial proximity (= companion and accompanee are conceptualised as occupying contiguous sub-regions in space). All this boils down to relative closeness of the two participants – ranging from extreme closeness (= identity) to abstract closeness (= be allies). (Stolz, Stroh & Urdze 2006: 361)

**Stages for the extension from locative to comitative:**
(generic locative ---> specialized human locative --->) comitative
human beings are not good landmarks of spatial relations, as they are highly mobile entities → location with respect to a human landmark often really indicates location in his/her habitual space, CF. French chez ‘at’ (only with human landmarks):

(1) Je suis chez mon frère (mais il n’est pas là).
    I am at my brother but he not is not there
    “I am at my brother’s (place), but he’s not there.”

Compare an inanimate landmark:

(2) Je suis à la gare (*mais elle [=la gare] n’est pas là).
    I am at the station but she [the station] not is not there
    “I am at the station (*but it’s not there).”

On the other hand, comitative generally indicates that the accompanee is present:

(3) Je suis avec mon frère (*mais il n’est pas là).
    I am with my brother (*but he not is not there)
    “I am at with brother (*but he’s not there).”
Further extension of comitative

Stolz (2001) comitatives tend to be re-interpreted as marking the possessum → being with something equals to possessing something. (Examples from Stolz 2001):

(1)  Hamisi a-na kitabu
    Hamisi 3SG-with book
    “Hamsa has a book.”

(2)  e sentouse porque estava com medo
    and sit:PRET.3SG+REFL because be:IMPF.3SG with fear
    “And he sat down because he was afraid.”

This type of extension follows quite naturally from the assumption that possessor and possessee need to be in close spatial proximity: if possession implies spatial proximity, then it can also be the case that spatial proximity indicates possession (Heine 1990).
Other infrequent syncretisms involving human participants

Passive agent + Comitative
- Comitative + Instrumental ok
- Instrumental + Passive agent ok

Comitative + Recipient/Beneficiary
- Locative + Instrumental ok
- Comitative + Instrumental ok
- Locative + Recipient/Beneficiary ok
Other infrequent syncretisms involving human participants

**Why?**

- Agent, Comitative, Recipient/Beneficiary: common feature $\rightarrow$ human
- Human participants are more versatile than inanimate participants and ask for more fine grained distinctions

(1) *That book has been written by a friend of mine*

(2) *That book has been written with a friend of mine*

(3) *I bought a book for Mary*

(4) *I bought a book with Mary*
“Classical semantic maps can also integrate information about the frequency of polysemy patterns. As stressed by Cysouw (2007, p. 232), in traditional semantic maps, “the boundary between attested and unattested is given a very high prominence,” since the unique attestation of a polysemy pattern will be represented on the map exactly as a very common one, namely, with a simple edge between two nodes (see further Croft & Poole, 2008).” (Georgakopoulos & Polis 2018)

distance based maps are not implicational and cannot be used to constraint the data (Malchukov, 2010: 177).

MDS method has been criticized because it cannot take into account diachronic information, if available (Narrog, 2010; van der Auwera, 2008, 2013).
We also find that all languages have substantial transitional areas between these three domains, and that the Source domain is no exception: in the maps, the Source domain blends seamlessly into the Location and Goal domains. But the overlap between Goal and Location is greater, so the findings support general typological observations. ... We found that there is substantial interaction between the Source and Location domains, especially when a notion of proximity is involved. Hence, our investigation does not support the previous claims that the Source domain in Indo-European languages is clearly separated from the other two basic spatial domains. This finding may partially relate to a difference in methodology: the data-driven, statistical approach in this paper is inherently more likely to find gradient patterns than the classical approach to semantic maps, which tends to maximize differences. (Eckhoff, Thomason & de Swart 2013: 349)
Greek (Mark 12:36)
kathou   ek  dexion  mou
sit.PRS.IMP.2SG from right.N.GEN.PL 1SG.PN.GEN

Gothic
sit    af  taihswon  meinai
sit.IMP.2SG from right.F.DAT.SG my.F.DAT.SG
‘sit at my right hand!’

Greek (Luke 10:7)
en autēi    de  tēi  oikiai  menete,
in  DEM.F.DAT.SG but the house.F.DAT.SG stay.PRS.IMP.2PL
esthontes    kai  pinontes    ta
eat.PRS.PTCP.M.NOM.PL and drink.PRS.PTCP.M.NOM.PL the.N.ACC.SG
par’ autōn
from 3PL.PN.GEN.PL
‘remain in that house, eating and drinking what they have’
Connection between Source and Location according to the authors

Latin

\textit{in eadem autem domo manete edentes}
\textit{et bibentes quae apud illos}

and \textit{drink.PRS.PTCP.M.NOM.PL} which.F.NOM.PL near \textit{them.M.ACC.PL}
\textit{ sunt be.PRS.3PL}

Old Church Slavic

\textit{въ томь же дому пребывайте едощь}
\textit{и пиюше еже съть и нйхь}

and \textit{drink.PRS.PTCP.M.NOM.PL} which.N.NOM.PL be.PRS.3PL near \textit{3PL.PN.GEN}
‘remain in that house, eating and drinking what they have”

BUT Possible error in Greek \textit{tà par’autoîs} does in fact mean „their possessions“ (Luraghi 2003: 140) in cases in which the condition of spatial proximity also holds
Inverted function of preposition and verbal prefix rather than contact of Source with Location

Greek (Matthew 8:34)

hopōs metabēi apo tōn oriōn autōn
so.that go.over.aor.sbjv.3sg from the region.gen.pl 3pl.pn.gen

Gothic

ei uslipi hindar markos ize
so.that go.out.pst.opt.3sg beyond region.acc.pl 3pl.pn.gen
‘so that he should go away from (Goth: beyond) their region’

Greek: verbal prefix meta- ‘beyond’; preposition apō ‘from’
Gothic: verbal prefix us- ‘from’; preposition hindar ‘beyond’
Different construal

Greek (John 12:36)

*ekrubē* ap’ *autōn*
hide.AOR.PASS.3SG from 3PL.PN.GEN

Gothic

*gafalh* *sik* *faura* *im*
hide.PST.3SG self.ACC.SG before 3PL.PN.M.DAT
‘he hid from (Goth: before) them’
From ablative to locative – Latin to Italian

quamquam cessere magis quam pulsi hostes sunt, quia ab although withdrew rather than pushed enemies are because from tergo erant clivi, in quos ... tutus receptus fuit. back were mountains in which safe shelter was “but the enemies withdrew, rather than be pushed away, because behind them were hills, which offered a safe shelter” Liv. 2.65.2; tunc crucifixi sunt cum eo duo latrones unus a dextris et then crucified are with him two robbers one from right and unus a sinistris one from left “then there were two robbers crucified with him, one on his right hand and one on the left”. Matth. 27.38.
Medieval Latin:

dab uno latere fine terra Teutoni dab alio latere
from (de+ab) one side territory Germans from other side
terra Sancti Petri territory Saint Peter

“on one side the territory of the Germans, on the other side the territory of the Pope” Cartulario Eccl. Terami 9th-12th century.

- nouns: parte, latere, caput, pede, sera, meridie, occasum, oriente, occasional proper names
- verbs: esse, stare., habere
Early Italian (13th-15th century):

a) location

*da* *poppa stava il* *celestial* *nocchiero*

from stern stood the heavenly helmsman

“the heavenly helmsman stood on the stern” (Dante, *Purg.* 2.43)

- adverbial locutions *di sotto da, di sopra da, davanti da, dinanzi da, dentro da, intorno da* (Mod. Italian mostly *a*)
- *by, nearby* with urban landmarks (churches, official buildings, etc.)
- sporadically: *by* with animate nouns or pronouns

*ma loro arme e lor cavalli lassaro dai pagani*

but their weapons and their horses they left from+the pagans

“they left their weapons and their horses by the pagans” (*Ritmo lucchese*, 1213)
non muove la questione *appo coloro che si conviene*
not moves the matter by those that is appropriate
“he does not raise the matter with the appropriate people” (Rett. 63.17)

*andati a lui* gli dissono ciò che era seguito
gone to him him told that which was followed
“having gone to him, they told him what followed” (Trec. 481.134)
direction (infrequent)

*io ... vi menerò da lei*
I you will take from her
“I will take you to her” (Boccaccio Dec. 2.10)
Italian da:

- Source (inanimate LMs)
- Path with verbs that incorporate path, all types of LM: *passare da casa* ‘pass by home’,
  
  *sono passata da mia madre*
  
  “I passed by my mother’s place’
- Direction/location with inanimate LMs that indicate sides:
  
  *si trovano / vanno da quella parte*
  
  ‘they are on that side / are going in that direction’
- Direction/location (human LMs)
Unresolvable ambiguity:

- Location and agent with human landmarks

La carne è stata comprata dal macellaio
the meat is been bought DA butcher
‘The meat has been bought BY the butcher / AT the butcher’s’

L’auto è stata lavata dal benzinaio
the car is been washed DA gas.station.worker
‘The car has been washed BY the gas station worker / AT the gas station’

Impossible prepositional encoding:

- Source with human landmarks

Vengo / vado dal macellaio, dal benzinaio
I.come I.go DA butcher DA gas.station.worker
→ Only possible interpretation: goal
Thank you for your attention!
INCORPORATING DIACHRONIC INFORMATION IN SEMANTIC MAPS

References available upon request